

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

ADT SERVICES, AG, et al.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 10-2197

THOMAS BRADY, et al.,

Defendants.

/

ORDER DIRECTING FURTHER BRIEFING

Because “the record contains signs . . . that, under a previous judge, Defendants impeded discovery,” a July 10, 2013, order allowed Plaintiffs to move to compel at a late stage in the action. In their motion Plaintiffs seek to compel Defendants “to produce *all* documents” that respond to an April 12, 2013, request for production. The request for production, in turn, asks Defendants both to supplement responses to several of Plaintiffs’ earlier discovery requests and to comply with several discovery orders.

Plaintiffs plainly demand a recent list of Defendants’ customers. Other than that, however, they pursue documents only broadly and obscurely. Neither the motion to compel nor the request for production identifies discrete categories of unproduced papers, and, as a result, it is impossible to award Plaintiffs specific, delimited relief, or to issue an order that Defendants can with management observe. (Likewise it is impossible to assess Plaintiffs’ argument that the obstruction of discovery warrants the appointment of a damages expert.) More description is probably sufficient, but certainly necessary; Plaintiffs, to get more documents, must give more detail. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs shall by **August 28, 2013**, in no more than four pages, supplement the motion to compel with an exact—and restrained—request for production.

s/Robert H. Cleland
ROBERT H. CLELAND
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: August 21, 2013

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, August 21, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa Wagner
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk
(313) 234-5522